

EXHIBIT “B”

Electronically Filed
11/13/2018 3:03 PM
Steven D. Grerson
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 COMP
2 LANE S. KAY, ESQ.
3 Nevada Bar No. 5031
4 LAW OFFICE OF LANE S. KAY
5 *A Professional Corporation*
6 819 South Sixth Street
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
8 e-mail LSKESQ21@aol.com
9 Ph.: (702) 384-1504
10 Fax (702) 384-4322
11 Attorney for Plaintiffs

8 DISTRICT COURT
9 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

10 PENNY DRAKE-TYNER; MICHAEL HANSEN,) A-18-784432-C.
11 Plaintiffs,) Case No.:
12 vs.) Dept. No.: Department 29
13 NICOLAS L. HATCHER; GEISER BROS.)
14 DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT, INC., and DOES I)
15 through V, ROE CORPORATIONS, I through V,)
16 inclusive.)
17 Defendants.)
18

19 COMPLAINT

20 COMES NOW plaintiffs, PENNY DRAKE-TYNER and MICHAEL HANSEN, by and
21 through their attorney, LANE S. KAY, ESQ., of the *Law Office of Lane S. Kay, P.C.*, and for their
22 causes of action against the Defendants, and each of them, allege as follows:

23 1. That at all times relevant to these proceedings, plaintiffs PENNY DRAKE-TYNER
24 and MICHAEL HANSEN (hereinafter "PLAINTIFFS") were residents of the County of Clark, State
25 of Nevada.

26 ///

1 2. That at all times relevant herein, upon information and belief, defendant NICOLAS
2 L. HATCHER (hereinafter "Defendant HATCHER") was a resident of the County of Maricopa , City
3 of Phoenix, State of Arizona.

4
5 3. That at all times relevant herein, upon information and belief, Defendant GEISER
6 BROS. DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT INC., (hereinafter "GEISER BROS"), a Domestic for Profit
7 Corporation, was and is domiciled in the state of Arizona, was doing business and authorized to
8 conduct systematic and continuous business in Clark County, Nevada. Defendant GEISER BROS is
9 in the off-road racing business and offers pre-race preparation and race day support services for desert
10 and short-course racing that do take place in Clark County, Nevada.

11
12 4. That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
13 otherwise of the Defendants named herein as DOES I through V are unknown to Plaintiffs who,
14 therefore, sue said Defendants by said fictitious names; Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and
15 thereon allege, that each of the Defendants designated as DOES are responsible in some manner for
16 the events and happenings referred to, and caused damages proximately to Plaintiffs as herein alleged,
17 and Plaintiffs will ask leave of this Court to amend the Complaint to insert the true names and
18 capacities of DOES I through V when the same has been ascertained and to join such Defendants in
19 this action.

20
21 5. That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
22 otherwise of the Defendants named herein as ROE CORPORATIONS I through V are unknown to
23 Plaintiffs who, therefore, sue said Defendants by said fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and
24 believe and thereon allege that each of the Defendants designated as ROE CORPORATIONS are
25 responsible in some manner for the events and happenings referred to, and caused damages
26 proximately to Plaintiffs as herein alleged, and Plaintiffs will ask leave of this Court to amend the

1 Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of ROE CORPORATIONS I through V when the
2 same have been ascertained and to join such Defendants in this action.

4 6. That at all material times, Defendants, and each of them, were individuals and/or
5 entities who were and are agents, masters, servants, employers, employees, joint ventures,
6 representatives and/or associates, and with the consent, knowledge, authorization, ratification and
7 permission of each other. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants, and each of them, engaged in
8 concerted acts and/or were responsible for the acts and/or omissions of themselves and each other.
9 Defendant and held a special relationship with Plaintiff and with the other defendants, non-delegable
0 in nature, and subject to a peculiar and high risk of harm for breach thereof.

7. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant HATCHER was an employee of Defendant GEISER BROS and that HATCHER was acting in the course and scope of his employment for GEISER BROS during all times which gave rise to the injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiffs.

8. That each named DOE and ROE Defendant negligently, willfully, intentionally, recklessly, vicariously, or otherwise, caused, directed, allowed or set in motion the injurious events set forth herein.

9. That each named Defendant, as well as any Defendant designated as DOE or ROE entity are legally responsible for the events and happenings stated in this Complaint, and this proximately caused injury and damages to Plaintiffs as alleged herein.

10. That all facts and circumstances that give rise to the subject lawsuit occurred in Clark County, Nevada.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

11. That on or about November 24, 2016, Plaintiffs were asked by Defendant HATCHER if they wanted to ride in an off-road racing trophy truck that his employer, Defendant GEISER BROS.,

had instructed Defendant HATCHER to get ready for a pre-run race that was taking place in either Las Vegas or Pahrump on November 26, 2016. Defendant HATCHER drove out to a desert area in Las Vegas, Nevada to test out the trophy truck. Both Plaintiffs had asked Defendant HATCHER to help them secure the very complicated harness system in the truck. Defendant HATCHER informed both Plaintiffs that there was no need to secure the harness because they would not be going that fast or that fast. Defendant HATCHER did fasten his own harness system. Defendant HATCHER, in the course and scope of his employment for GEISER BROS in getting the trophy truck ready for the race on November 26, 2016, carelessly and negligently drove the trophy truck at a high rate of speed in a desert area that he was not familiar with and subsequently crashed into a ditch. Both Plaintiffs were tossed about the interior of the trophy truck because there were not properly restrained in the harness system in the trophy truck, and both Plaintiffs sustained serious injuries. Defendant GEISER BROS. carelessly and negligently failed to educate, train, and supervise their employee HATCHER and as a proximate result, Plaintiffs sustained serious, disfiguring, and disabling injuries. When Defendant HATCHER notified his employer, GEISER BROS., about the accident involving Plaintiffs, he was instructed to bring the trophy truck back to Phoenix, Arizona so it could be repaired and brought back to Las Vegas, Nevada for the race on November 26, 2016.

12. That by the reason of Defendants negligent acts and as a direct and proximate result thereof, PLAINTIFFS have sustained great pain of body and mind, and mental stress and anxiety, all or some of which conditions may be permanent and disabling in nature, all to PLAINTIFFS' damage in amounts to be determined at trial.

13. That as a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have suffered physical injuries, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown at this time. Said Plaintiffs have also incurred medical expenses in amounts to be determined at trial.

1 14. That as a direct and proximate result of the negligence of Defendants, and each of
2 them, Plaintiffs have lost income, employment benefits and loss of earning capacity in amounts to be
3 determined at trial.
4

5 15. That Plaintiffs had to retain the services of an attorney to prosecute this action and
6 are entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein.

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, expressly reserving the right to amend their Complaint at the time
8 of trial of the actions herein to include all items of damages not yet ascertained, demand judgment
9 against Defendants, and each of them as follows:
10

- 11 1. General damages in an amount in excess of \$15,000.00;
- 12 2. Damages for costs of medical care and treatment and costs incidental thereto,
13 both past and future when the same have been fully ascertained;
- 14 3. For Loss of Earnings, benefits, and future earning capacity, both past and
15 present;
- 16 4. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 17 5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper in the premises.
18

19 DATED this 12 day of November, 2018.
20

21 LAW OFFICE OF LANE S. KAY
22 *A Professional Corporation*

23 By: _____
24

25 LANE S. KAY, ESQ.
26 Nevada Bar No. 5031
27 819 South Sixth Street
28 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 (702) 384-1504
 Attorney for Plaintiffs
 PENNY DRAKE-TYNER and
 MICHAEL HANSEN